

Ch. Lambton

A N
A N S W E R
T O
T H E R E P L Y
T O T H E
S U P P O S E D T R E A S U R Y P A M P H L E T.

L O N D O N :
P R I N T E D F O R J O H N S T O C K D A L E ,
O P P O S I T E
B U R L I N G T O N H O U S E , P I C C A D I L L Y .
M D C C L X X X V .

[Price Two Shillings.]

Printed and Published by
T. H. B. R. E. P. L. Y.
LONDON:
[Faint text, likely publisher information]
[Faint text, likely price information]

man in office; but it is of little consequence to the

these impositions. I am, however, always of in-
parture to defend the dignity of talents, to expose
the misrepresentations of talents, and to establish
in this place real fact and just testimony, as the
only means of judging of the merits of the public men.

A N

A N S W E R, &c.

EVERY liberal man must regret, with the
Right Honourable Author of the Reply,
That no attempt can be now made to convey ac-
curate information to the people, on subjects the
most important to their interests, without an im-
mediate imputation of selfish motives, or sinister
purposes.

A lamentation, "that the public mind should
"be poisoned by the artful insinuations of design-
"ing men, whose ambitious views are promoted
"by encouraging deception," comes with peculiar
propriety from the avowed apologist of the late
concessions to Ireland, and the strenuous opponent
of the present arrangements, which proceeded
from them.

The Reply is as confidently attributed to the
late paymaster general as his text is to a gentle-
man

man in office: but it is of little consequence to the world, whether there is any ground for either of these imputations. It is, however, always of importance to detect the designs of faction, to expose the misrepresentations of fallacy, and to establish in their place real facts and just reasonings, as the only means of judging in respect to interesting measures and public men.

To point out every disingenuity of the Right Honourable Author, or to exhibit every substitution of words of his own for the words of his text, which occur in almost every page of his reply, would be a task as tedious and unprofitable as it would be dull. In discussing, however, this subject, it is impossible not to recollect the just sentiments of Mr. Eden on a similar occasion. "We must divest ourselves," said he to Lord Carlisle *, "of all prejudices contracted from the popular altercations of the day; we must endeavour to enter upon the subject with as much benevolence, and as little partiality, as may be compatible with the just interests of the Society to which we belong. The wish, indeed, of all good and prudent men, both in Great Britain and Ireland, must be, to shun with abhorrence all the outrageous delirium incident to national questions, and to promote only that constitutional warmth, which may act kindly and with an invigorating influence in both kingdoms."

When Mr. Eden wrote thus,—“The growing distresses of Ireland had overpowered the endeavours of Great Britain to avert them;” and we were then loudly told, *That nothing short of a free trade could give relief.* In the general anxiety

* Letter 4 Nov. 1779.

to assist Ireland, the House of Commons re-founded with the cry: " Let Ireland have a *free trade*;" " since there is trade enough for every nation on earth, if all impolitic restrictions were removed: " For, whatever promotes the commerce of Ireland will alternately promote that of Great-Britain *."

Lord North himself was at length roused by the spirit of the times. He resolved to grant a *free* and *equal* trade to Ireland. But, the same irresolution, which brought about the independence of the Colonies, at the expence of an hundred millions, produced a change of his original purpose. And the export of glass and woollens, together with the trade to the Levant, to Africa, to the West-Indies, and to America, were only granted † to the requests of Ireland for a *free* trade.

It may, however, be observed, that it was not then generally agreed (and still less is it now) what ought to be comprehended under the expression, *Free Trade*. " It is impossible," said Mr. Eden to Lord Carlisle, " in the nature of Commerce, to decide, without a full investigation of the subject, what can be meant, or ought to be meant, by a *free trade*."—" Do the Irish mean to ask a free trade to Britain, their manufactures and produce, when imported, being subject to no other duties than the like manufactures and produce of our own?"—It is pretty well known, that Mr. Eden's letters to Lord Carlisle formed *The Treasury Pamphlet* of their day. Written, as they certainly were, in concert with the minister, he

* See Debrett's Debates, during the Session of 1779-80.

† By 20 Geo. III. ch. 6. 10. 18.

surely knew, when he conveyed his wishes, his own intention for the moment at least. It is therefore evident, that the original plan of Lord North and the present arrangements of Mr. Pitt are nearly the same: Yet, this position is nowhere stated in the text of the Right Honourable Commentator, though, consistent with truth, it might have been safely done, had it been of any importance, in forming a true judgement of measures which require no such feeble support.

Our very consistent Commentator, who had so often reprobated Lord North's want of wisdom and efficacy, now stoutly contends, that the Irish business was concerted on system; that Lord North did possess sufficient energy and power to perfect his plan; that his arrangements have been carried uninterruptedly into full execution*. Yet Mr. Eden told the House of Commons a very different tale, in April, 1782, of "the alarming situation of Ireland †."—"The discontents and jealousies of Ireland," said Mr. Secretary Fox, on that occasion, "have risen to be very dangerous and alarming."—The pretensions of the Irish comprehended, according to this Minister, not only their *commercial* rights and privileges, but also the legislative power and royalty ‡.—Whatever blame there might be

* See p. 22—24.

† See Debrett's Debates, vol. VII. p. 2.—Mr. Eden's motion for the repeal of the obnoxious Declaratory Act.

‡ See Debrett's Debates, vol. VII. p. 24-5. On the 9th day of April, 1782, Mr. Secretary Fox, who had been only a few days in office, delivered the following message from his Majesty to the House: "His Majesty being concerned to find that discontents and jealousies are prevailing among his loyal subjects in Ireland, upon matters of great weight and consequence, earnestly recommends to this House to take the same

be discovered in the business, Mr. Fox did not impute a particle of it to Ireland; "but laid it all at the door of the late Administration." "Yet," says the Right Honourable Coadjutor of these Right Honourable Members, "Ireland broke out into raptures of joy and exultation; and bonfires and illuminations were the testimonies which she gave of that benefit, which, our author tells us, had lost its effect."—Upon what authority then, he asks, is it, that the New System has been formed at the desire of Ireland *?

He may be answered, on the acknowledgement of his associates in party, and the authority of facts. The first sentiment of the Irish, under Lord Carlisle's administration was "fear," says Mr. Eden †, "that the same power which had conferred a free trade might resort back again to the commercial monopoly that had just been broken." These commercial jealousies rose, according to Mr. Fox ‡, "to an alarming degree." Lord Northington was sent to govern Ireland, without carrying with him *commercial* redress of *commercial* grievances. And, under his administration, her jealousies continued, and her confusions increased. The shelves of office are loaded with this Lord Lieutenant's dispatches, conveying the Irish con-

"same into their most serious consideration, in order to such a final adjustment as may give a mutual satisfaction to both kingdoms."—Mr. Secretary explained to the House that these discontents comprehended *commercial* grievances. Yet, no *commercial* redress was given.

* Reply, p. 16—24.

† See his famous Speech on the 8th of April 1782. Debrett's Debates, vol. VII. p. 2.

‡ See his Speech on the subsequent day. Debrett's Debates, vol. VII. p. 25.

structions of the act of navigation, and praying for Leave to send American products from their ports to Britain. His administration was pestered with pamphlets on their commercial grievances by the ablest Members of the Irish Parliament. Protecting duties were thereupon moved for, as adequate redress was still withheld. The Members who resisted these motions were insulted by the populace, and were obliged to ask for the protection of the military. Non-importation agreements were instantly adopted. And these tumultuary remedies were administered by violences the most shocking to the feelings, and most terrible to the apprehensions, of peaceful citizens. Foreign powers thought they saw the American troubles renewed in Ireland. And every discerning foreigner became convinced, before the end of the year 1783, that the same steps would conduct Ireland to a similar station of absolute independence. Yet, our candid Commentator insists *, “ that her wishes were gratified, and her complaints removed.”

In this spirit he assures us †, “ that Lord North’s concessions were granted in consequence of an authorized communication between the two nations:—but, the present negotiation has been carried on more like a dark and dangerous conspiracy against both states.” Blinded by his zeal of opposition, our Commentator sees no object in its just light. He does not consider the Resolves and Address of the British Parliament to the King as any authority. The necessity, arising from the “ alarming state of Ireland,” is no justification, it seems, of a measure of redress. The ardent de-

* P. 16.

† Ibid.

fires of two kingdoms, that their future intercourse might be finally settled, are as little worthy of notice. And the two ministers of great trust and responsibility, in each kingdom, who adjusted the outlines of this difficult business, are, in our Author's dispassionate judgement *, "dark and dangerous conspirators."

But, he complains †, "that the secret of this adjustment was preserved with the utmost care." And, in the same breath, he warmly recommends "Lords Sheffield's Useful Observations," which were published with the avowed design of exposing the arrangements before they were opened in the Irish Parliament. His lordship too laments, that the important business was concealed from the public, and yet "reasons on the general notoriety of those measures ‡," which were thus kept secret. It is not so easy then, as our sagacious Commentator imagines, to keep a secret in "this end of Europe."

It might have been expected, says the Right Honourable Commentator ||, in the same tone of confidence and candour, "that a Secretary of the Treasury would have paid some attention to the revenue." It was not necessary to be in such a station to discover, in discussing the Irish arrangements, that the revenue would in no possible way be materially affected by them: for, in direct drawbacks, duties, and bounties, the amount is too

* P. 16.

† Ibid.

‡ See Lord Sheffield's Prefatory Advertisement, p. 2. which is dated the 25th of Jan. 1785. The Resolutions of the Irish Parliament were passed on the 12th of February thereafter. So that his Lordship had had time previous to the 25th of January, to write his huge pamphlet, after he knew the great outlines of the proposed arrangements.

|| P. 9.

trifling to deserve mention: and, with respect to smuggling, no new facility will be thereby created. The Report of the Commissioners of the Customs has established this point very decidedly, as to the revenue of customs. The Commissioners of Excise have stated, indeed, apprehensions of danger, from drawbacks being hereafter allowed of the duties on foreign spirits; and, departing from the line of their duty, they call upon the West India Merchants to attend to their peculiar interests on a point which they had already resolved could not affect them: but as, from their official situation, the Commissioners of Excise must doubtless have represented their apprehensions, on that subject, previously to the Minister, it is impossible to doubt his having guarded against any inconvenience which might arise from the drawbacks on foreign spirits, if it had even escaped his notice before. There can, indeed, be no reason assigned, why the duties should not be retained on the exportation of that article in both the kingdoms; as this retention would secure the revenue of each. The danger of importing foreign rum is not very apparent, considering, that it has never been an article for sale, to any extent, in the foreign West Indies; and that the importation of it is equally prohibited in Ireland, as it is in Britain.

The Commissioners of Excise have made another observation, which gives room for a comment, if respect for such a board did not prevent it. They remarked, “ that the smuggler, knowing the re-
 “ source of regular importation will be always ready
 “ for him, may be tempted before he comes to the
 “ Custom house to try his success upon the open
 “ coast, convinced that, if he succeeds, his gain
 “ will

been spared the blush of declaring * “ how happy
“ it had been for the peace of the empire, if the
“ wise, temperate, and cautious proceedings of
“ Lord North’s days had been imitated by the
“ present administration.”

LET us now examine the two general heads,
into which the late Paymaster has chosen to divide
the chief strength of his Reply :

1st, Whether the navigation, or trade, of Great-
Britain, is likely to be affected in any material
degree, if the produce of Africa and America
should be permitted to be sent from Ireland to this
country?

2dly, Whether the produce and manufactures
of Ireland will be able to enter into competition
with the produce and manufactures of this country
in our own markets, if the Irish should be per-
mitted to bring them here on the payment of
equalizing duties, with all the charges of im-
portation?

It has been proved, “ That the prospect of ad-
“ vantages to Ireland are not particularly flatter-
“ ing in this part of the arrangement.” Our in-
dignant Author was thence induced to inquire † :
“ If Ireland is to gain no advantage, why is she
“ represented as contending the point with such
“ earnestness, or rather with so commanding a tone,

* P. 24.

† P. 26.

“ that

“ that we dare not deny her.” It is easy for disputants to obtain a momentary triumph, by shifting the terms of their adversary.

Ireland, standing now on equal ground, must be allowed to be the only judge of her own interests. If she chooses to send her linens to a distant market of doubtful sale, instead of a neighbouring one of certain advantage, whatever we may think of her prudence, we must allow, that she has a right to follow her inclination. If she desires to send her surpluses of American produce to Britain, in the infancy of her traffick, where she must meet the powerful competition of the British factors, in the improved state of their commerce; whatever we may think of the probability of her success, we must admit her right to determine for herself. In any event, the present inequality is painful and humiliating to a people who have just been restored to an equal station. Whether the navigation system is best understood by the one Author or the other, and to which of them ignorance and impudence is most deservedly applied, must be left to the public to decide. Certain it is, our greatest writers speak of the act of navigation in a very different style from our very accurate Commentator.

Sir Joshua Child treated of *The Act of Navigation*, after it had been “ of seventeen or eighteen years standing *,” and after the passing of the 15 Charles II. 23 Charles II. and other Custom-house laws of that reign. Davenant speaks of *The Act of Navigation* † immediately after the 7th and 8th of king William had adopted its spirit and enforced its provisions. Forty years after,

* Discourse, p. 94—9.

† III. v. p. 84.

Sir Matthew Decker considered *The Act of Navigation* as a monopoly injurious to trade. And Dr. Adam Smith has lately stated the advantages and disadvantages of *The Act of Navigation*, in a manner the most satisfactory and convincing. These writers may perhaps lead to a determination who ought most to be regarded as “an ignorant innovator.”

The imputation of extreme ignorance, or extreme impudence, was occasioned by the assertion *in the text*, “That much contrariety of opinion had been held in Great Britain and Ireland about the interpretation of *The Navigation Act*; yet the modest and well-informed author of the Reply had proofs of the truth of that assertion in his own power. He could not have mixed with men of business from Ireland without hearing the subject discussed; though no sort of stress was laid on it in the text, nor any arguments deduced from it. In Michaelmas term, 20 Charles II. it was determined by the Court of Exchequer, after *four years argument*, That the words *foreign growth or manufacture*, in the 4th section of the Act of Navigation, were meant of the goods of Asia, Africa, and America, but not of Europe. The very act quoted by the author of the Reply proves, that the Act of Navigation was differently understood in the two countries: For the preamble of the 12th Geo. III. recites, “that rum, sugar, coffee, and other American and Asiatic goods, have been entered outwards for exportation, in the kingdom of Ireland, to be imported into Great Britain, and have been clandestinely and illegally landed in this kingdom, notwithstanding the act 12 Cha. II. cha. 18.” This recital

recital plainly shews, that the Custom-house in one kingdom cleared outwards the ships which the Custom-house in the other could not admit to an entry.

The independence given to the Irish legislature has not only repealed this act of the 12th Geo. III. but has created inextricable difficulties in ascertaining what the trade laws now are between the sister kingdoms. The acts of the 15th Char. II. 23d Char. II. 7 and 8 William III. and the 3-4 of Anne, which are cited with great exultation as shutting the ports of Ireland, are equally repealed by that measure of his friends. And it was probably in order to fix the merit or demerit of acknowledging the independence of the Irish legislature, without concert or regard for consequences, on the true authors, that the Irish Revolution was mentioned in the text, and by other writers; who have also attributed our present perplexities to that event.

Mr. Yelverton's act has adopted (as stated in the text) the laws of Great Britain, *only so far as they confer equal advantages, or impose equal restraints, on both kingdoms.* "But there happens," says the author of the Reply, "to be an Irish act, which specifically adopts the English Navigation Acts." In his petulant zeal to impute absurd ignorance, or designed concealment, to his opponent, he gives us strong reason to suspect his own. The Irish act of the 14th and 15th Char. II. ch. 9. which directs *The Act of Navigation* to be duly observed, could not adopt English Acts that had then no existence. The Irish law enforces *The Act of Navigation* alone by its English title, when it requires

5 the

the Custom-house officers “ to take care, that the
 “ act passed in England, intituled, *An Act for the*
 “ *encouraging and increasing of Shipping and Na-*
 “ *igation*, be from time to time duly observed
 “ and executed.” And the author of the criti-
 cised Pamphlet, with the Irish laws before him,
 argues throughout, that *The Act of Navigation* is
 a fundamental law of Ireland.

The Irish now argue, that, whatever the con-
 struction of the law has been, it is at present unrea-
 sonable they should be deprived of the same advan-
 tage of sending West India produce from their
 ports to Britain, which the English have of send-
 ing to them; that they think the inequality the
 more unreasonable, as it is contrary to an equitable
 construction of the navigation act itself: Our ships
 and our seamen, say they, were declared to be
 English: WE were admitted to that, which we
 had indeed always enjoyed, an unrestrained trade
 to the transatlantic dominions of the Crown: By
 a liberal construction of the Act of Navigation, the
 continental Colonies were always allowed to send
 West India produce from their own to Bri-
 tain; and, without possessing equal merits, now
 enjoy the very right which WE think, on
 principles of equity, we ought in the same manner
 to possess, since we admit the English merchants as
 equal competitors with the Irish traders in our own
 markets.

The author of the Reply; however, without re-
 gard to consequences, inculcates, that no such in-
 dulgence ought to be granted:—We insist, says
 he, on the letter of the law: Without the mono-
 poly of the Plantation trade, we cannot *show our*
superiority, or *exercise the legislative rights* which
 belong

belong to the *superintending power of the Empire*. It is, however, a dread of this superiority, or a jealousy of this superintendence, which urges the present request more perhaps than any expectation of commercial advantages for a century to come. It was a similar jealousy, as we may learn from Mr. Eden, which induced the Irish to request a free legislature; "lest the power which had assumed a right to bind her, even after a free trade had been granted, might resort back again to that commercial monopoly which had just been broken*!" If, to allay this jealousy, or to remove this apprehension, Mr. Fox gave independence to the Irish legislature in 1782, and confirmed it in 1783, our Author, his Right Honourable Friend, ought to urge still stronger reasons for denying the commercial regulation, which the Irish *thus* consider as included in a *free and equal* trade; and which will, in all probability, be beneficial to our commerce, and will certainly increase our naval strength.

The Author of the criticised pamphlet is not the first writer who suggested a similar measure; nor is the present Minister the first statesman who adopted its liberal policy, without being accused, in the polite language of our refined Commentator, of ignorance and rashness, of self-sufficiency and inattention to the public welfare. Sir Josiah Child proposed, a century ago, a plan of union and of traffick extremely analogous to the present †.

Sir

* See Mr. Eden's speech on his motion to allow legislative independence to Ireland. Debrett's Debates, vol. VII. p. 2—3.

† "With entire submission to the greater wisdom of those, whom it much more concerns, give me leave to query, says
C "Sir

Sir Matthew Decker * suggested an idea somewhat similar, when he proposed, “to unite Ireland, and to put all our fellow subjects on the same footing in trade.” And one of the ablest writers of the present age recommends similar measures, though in different language: “this freedom of *interior* commerce,” says he, “is perhaps one of the principal causes of the prosperity of Great Britain; every great country being necessarily the best market for the greater part of the productions of its own industry. If the same freedom could be extended to Ireland, and the plantations, the prosperity of every part of the Empire would probably be still greater than at present.” Thus the Author of the Reply, by endeavouring to fix the charge of rashness and ignorance on the objects of his envy, clearly convicts himself.

In opposition, however, to these authorities, and to the reasonings of the criticized pamphlet, which he is more forward to misrepresent than studious to answer, our Commentator insists, that by opening the Irish ports to Britain, “Such † a competition will present itself to the British planter and

“Sir Josiah Child, whether, instead of the late prohibition of Irish Cattle, it would not have been much more for the benefit of this kingdom of England, to suffer the Irish to bring into England not only their live cattle, but *also all other commodities of the growth, or manufacture, of that kingdom, custom-free, or on easy customs*, and to prohibit them from trading homeward or outward with the Dutch, or our own plantations, or any other places except the kingdom of England? Most certainly such a law would in a few years wonderfully increase the trade, shipping, and riches of this country.” (Discourse, p. 95.)—Every one must perceive, that this is directly the reverse of what Lord North actually did.

* P. 163.

† P. 45.

“ merchant, as must leave them little hopes of sup-
 “ porting their trade or their credit, or of paying
 “ the heavy taxes with which they stand charged
 “ by government.” By such inflammatory lan-
 guage our Author attempts to divert the attention
 of the public from the true state of the question ;
 let us, therefore, clear it from the darkness in
 which his misrepresentations have involved it.
 When Lord North allowed the Irish to export
 their manufactures to Africa, to the West Indies,
 and America, the Irish were admitted to these
 profitable markets as the competitors of British
 merchants. Had our Author’s declamation been
 levelled against this famous measure, it had had
 the appearance of argument at least *. When
 Lord North admitted the Irish to bring into their
 own ports directly the produce of the Colonies,
 he thereby created the most powerful competition,
 because the Irish came *directly* to their own markets ;
 while the British merchants went thither by a
circuitous voyage. Here too our Author might
 have raised his voice to some advantage, if he had
 not been entangled in his own absurdity, of sup-
 posing, that the traders, who bring their goods
 to market by a *direct* voyage, can be underfold by
 the traders who come by a *circuitous* one. When
 Mr. Fox, perhaps properly, permitted the Irish to
 regulate their foreign trade in their own way, he
 gave the Irish traders an opportunity of appearing
 as competitors with the British merchants in every
 European market.

* This was, in fact, an abandonment of the monopoly of
 which the author and Lord North’s other friends now talk so
 much as an intraction of the law of Europe.

The proposed Arrangement, as to the opening of the Irish ports, contains then a very simple proposition. The Irish having thus been allowed to import West India produce directly to Ireland; having thus been permitted to send this produce all over Europe; it is proposed to allow them to send the surplus of such West India produce (if ever they should have any) from their own ports to Britain, where they may expect the most vigorous competition. It is against this proposal that our great Commentator has condescended to state some of his objections in detail.

THE SUPERIORITY OF PORTS.

The proposition which is maintained relating to them is, “ That the markets of Great Britain can “ be supplied with West India produce cheaper “ through Ireland, by a circuitous navigation, “ than by a direct importation from the West “ Indies.” And, to defend this novelty in commercial reasoning, the advantages of the ports of Britain are decried by our Commentator, and the harbours of Ireland exalted in their stead. The sea coast of Britain, which comprehends, according to Templeman, at least eight hundred marine leagues, can be no longer considered, it seems, as the most commodious for trade of any in Europe. And we are no more to give credit to the Survey of Campbell *, “ That we have as many large and

* I. v. p. 274—5.

“ safe bays, secure roads, and convenient ports,
 “ arising from the peculiar dispositions of our sea
 “ and shore, as any other country in Europe.”

Yet our Author admits the force of the remark of his adversary, that the Irish ports, lying on the Irish sea, from Belfast to Waterford, possess no one superiority over the English ports, on the opposite coast, from Whitehaven to Milford. In the comparison between Corke and the ports of the Bristol channel, our Commentator confesses his disappointment at finding so much superiority where he least expected it. It is the West coast of Ireland, from Cape Clear, on the South, to the Mullet, and even to Lough Swilly, on the North, where he contends for such superior advantages. Yet, having a very different purpose to answer, he very consistently exhibits “ the wild and thinly
 “ inhabited state of the far greater proportion of
 “ the coast of Ireland which the smuggler must first
 “ make on his return from the West Indies.” A wild and thinly inhabited coast, then, is to overpower the South-Western ports of England in every competition for freights.

But is it at all probable that a small advantage of local position, a little more to the West, or to the East, should fix the seat of commerce, or retain the residence of merchants? The “ wild and thinly
 “ inhabited shores” of Wales have not risen superior in trade to the English coasts of the neighbouring channel. And the merchants of Bristol choose rather to improve the course of the Avon than emigrate to Milford Haven, notwithstanding its alluring advantages.

FREIGHT

FREIGHT AND INSURANCE.

The notoriety of the fact compels our Commentator to admit *, that the freights and insurance from the ports of Ireland are not lower than from the more Eastern harbours of Britain. But he reprobates the reasoning of his opponent for arguing from the experience of the past to the probability of the future: he loses all moderation when he hears it said, that things having been always thus will probably continue in nearly the same state. Yet it is from this "experience of the past," the infallible guide of real business, that the planters, merchants, ships' owners, and insurers, fix the stated rate of their freights and insurance, both out and home, in peace and war. Settled, as these are, from year to year, by all these parties, from a mutual regard to each other's interests, the freights and insurance are probably as low at this moment as they can be reduced by any competition. And the West India business being carried on through a prescribed circle, which includes the mutual advantage of the planter and merchant, the ship husband and insurer, it is not likely to be diverted from its present channel.

The Author of the criticised pamphlet endeavours in vain to shew how unable the Irish are to enter successfully into such a competition, reasoning from their want of capitals and ships, of

* P. 47.

failors and cargoes. Our Commentator gives them all these by a dash of his pen: the allowing them to send West India produce from their own ports to Britain, will confer all these, and leave nothing to the English. Capital then is to be gained gratuitously, and not by ages of industry and care, by a contest with the ablest competitors. The opulent in Ireland, who get 6 *per cent.* interest on private security, and 7 *per cent.* on the public, are at once to invest their property in West India ships, which yield the smallest profit in proportion to the amount of the advance. The failors too are to accept of lower wages in proportion as this increase of shipping requires a greater number of hands. And the Irish are to furnish the miscellaneous cargoes which the West Indies require, on better terms than the British merchants can send them. The writer who argues thus is not to be envied; nor is the trader to be pitied who allows his credulity to affect his interest.

But, though our author admits, that freights and insurance are as cheap from London to the West Indies as from Limerick, yet he contends apparently against conviction, that the cause is only temporary. The provisions, says he, which the government had sent to the West Indies, during the war, have been sold in London, since the peace at any price. This assertion is so extraordinary, that it ought not to be credited without proof. But, it is an undoubted fact, that provisions were almost invariably bought in London in small quantities, during the war, as cheap as they could have been procured at Cork. This then is owing to a permanent cause. The truth is, not only provisions and linen, but every product of Ireland, which

may be imported duty-free, can be generally bought as cheap in London as in the Irish markets. In the same manner, the woollens of Yorkshire, the cottons of Manchester, the hardware of Birmingham, and the stockings of Nottingham, may be purchased cheaper in the warehouses of London than in the several places of manufacture. For, London is the great market, in which the sellers and buyers of the world assemble; the one set to sell as dear, and the other to buy as cheap, as possible. And it is from the competition of all parties, that the prices of every commodity are reduced to the lowest possible point.

Were we to argue from speculation with our Commentator rather than from experience, with the author of his text, we ought to infer, that London, from the dearness of provisions, and the high price of labour, ought to have long ago lost her ship-building and her trade. Would our Author allow us to appeal to facts, we should find, that, during the present century, the shipping of London has increased wonderfully. There were entered in London, during the year

		British Tons.
1694	—	60,000
1710	—	70,000
1718	—	187,000
1751	—	198,000
1758	—	125,000
1765	—	266,000
1775	—	364,000

The outports have augmented their shipping in the same proportion. But it is remarkable, that the greatest ports have increased their ships in the largest number; while the poorest have scarcely added

added any to their ancient stock. All this time there has been a free competition between London and the Outports, and between it and each individual one. Still, however, the rich and great over-power the poor and small. These facts, and these reasonings, may be applied to the competition which has existed, or may exist, between an opulent country and a poor one.

Our Commentator, however, insists * with a confidence almost peculiar to himself, " that, by opening the British market to Ireland, the American trade must infallibly become a monopoly to this country, as it has hitherto been to Great Britain." He allows his zeal to carry away his judgement. He forgets, that every man, and every party, have condemned monopolies, as inconsistent with freedom, and still more, as giving an injurious turn to the diligence of the industrious classes: He proves himself little acquainted with the commercial writers, who having shewn the *monopoly of the American trade* to be disadvantageous to the many, however gainful to the few, proposed to relax the monopoly, by admitting competition. The independence of the United States has relaxed the monopoly as to them; without injuring our American commerce. The admitting of the Irish into the West India ports still further relaxed the rigour of that monopoly, without enabling them, during seven years exertions, to supply their own consumption.

It is, however, insisted upon with peculiar pertinacity, that the lucrative object of British speculation, " is to be resigned to the Irish by admitting American produce into British mar-

* P. 40-1.

“kets through the Irish ports.” If they are not to enjoy a monopoly, they are yet, according to our Commentator, to have a competition so gainful as to amount to a monopoly. In this competition the British traders and planters are to supply the West-India demand from the great storehouses of London, Liverpool, and Bristol: The Irish traders are to send the West-India supplies, miscellaneous as they must be, from the narrow warehouses of Limerick and Cork: The British merchants and planters are to supply the British market with West-India commodities, by the *direct importation* of *one* voyage: The Irish are to supply the same market by the *round-about* importation of *two* voyages: The one are to be subjected only to the expence of *one* freight and insurance, *one* entry at the Custom-house, and *one* commission to the merchant: The others must incur the much greater expence of *double* freight and insurance, of *double* entries, and commissions, besides the risque of waste and the loss by delay. These reasonings of the text our Commentator sagely considers “as to the last degree absurd*.”

It having been stated, “that a very great proportion of the West-India estates belong to planters who resided in Britain; that much of the produce being under engagement to be consigned to merchants in Britain, and speculations, even on the *direct* importation, not having answered once in a hundred times;” our Commentator “appeals to every merchant in Great Britain, if he knows how the writer means to

* P. 40.

“ apply

“ apply such observations.” I desire to appeal to every merchant’s clerk, whether his master ever imports West-India produce on his own account: Let him instruct our Commentator, *That there is no arguing against facts.*

Having in this decisive manner convicted his text of manifest absurdity, our learned Commentator* pronounces a pompous panegyric on the *circuitous trade*, which has made us opulent, glorious, and great. Here too he clearly shews the extent of his reading, and the accuracy of his knowledge. A circuitous trade in opposition to a domestic trade! It has become almost proverbial, *That a home trade is always the best*: It is the best; because the returns of the foreign trade are very seldom so quick as those of the domestic trade: The returns of the latter generally come in once, and sometimes three or four times a year: The returns of the former do not come in always once a year, and often not in two or three years. A capital employed, therefore, in the home trade may be sent out and brought back twelve times before the capital employed in foreign trade has made one return or one profit. And it necessarily follows, that, if the capitals are equal, the one employed at home will give infinitely more encouragement to the industry of the people than the other. In proportion then as you widen the circle of commerce, the capital engaged in it becomes less gainful to the owner, and less advantageous to the community.

Our Commentator ought at least to have shewn, that we had long enjoyed a great circuitous trade,

* P. 34—5—6.

before he had exulted on the wealth derived from it. "It is certainly matter of serious regret," says Mr. Eden *, "that these islands, though aided by "the greatest local advantages, possess so little of "what is peculiarly called the carrying-trade of "Europe; which consists of supplying the North "with the goods of the South, and the South with "the goods of the North." And the same gentleman attributes the cause of what he thus regrets to our prohibitions on the import and export, and to the various restrictions of a monopolizing spirit. The carrying-trade is the natural effect of great national wealth, says Doctor Adam Smith; but it does not seem to be the natural cause of it. The Ministers, who have been disposed to favour it with particular encouragements, seem to have mistaken the symptom for the cause.

Our Commentator is rather unlucky, then, in the application of his doctrine of a *circuitous trade* to the measure of opening the ports of the sister kindoms to each other. Considering the Irish "as "our fellow-subjects," and their country as a most valuable part of the empire, the encouraging a mutual intercourse must be considered as a wise policy for the purpose of promoting that domestic trade, which, by every commercial writer, is extolled as highly beneficial to the individual, and advantageous to the state; because it yields the quickest return of capital, and is carried on within the sphere of every trader's comprehension and care. The trade between Great Britain and Ireland is therefore the next best trade to the commerce carried on among the people of Great Bri-

* 5 letter to Lord Carlisle.

tain themselves. Perfect freedom has rendered this commerce the most gainful to the industrious inhabitants of a nation which has had the wisdom to allow no restraints on its internal interchange of every commodity. Useful regulation in the naval intercourse between the sister kingdoms ought to be directed consequently, by similar means, to the same profitable end.

But our Commentator had been told, that *the Act of Navigation is a great sea charter*; and, without considering its provisions, or their tendency, he supposes, that this often-quoted law, which is so much praised and so little understood, had created the circuitous trade, the great object of his undistinguishing panegyrick. He did not perceive, that the various restrictions and prohibitions of the Navigation Act have necessarily prevented the circuitous trade, by *subjecting Britain to a disadvantage in every branch of trade of which she has not the monopoly*.

On the other hand, the judicious persons, who have spoken without prejudice on this subject, allow the Navigation Act every merit that its warmest admirers can wish, in respect to the naval power, which its provisions have certainly formed. On this head of its policy it deserves every commendation that the most eloquent tongue can utter, and every support which the most zealous patriot, warm with the love of his country, and participating in her safety and renown, can give to a wise system, directed to the noblest and most useful end. By opening freely the ports of the sister kingdoms to each other for ships navigated by *British* subjects, the *principle* of the Navigation Act will be extended, and its policy pursued, in
exact

exact proportion, as this measure would certainly create a greater body of British seamen. Our naval power would also be thereby invigorated, at the same time that our private wealth would be increased by additional freights, and by the various employments which a numerous shipping create.

But, it is one of the strongest objections to the proposed system, says our Commentator *, *that it entrusts the care of the navigation laws to the Irish officers.* This remark was probably borrowed from Lord North and Mr. Fox's earliest speeches on the subject, which was still more consistent in them than in our Commentator himself. It may be remembered, that the care of the Navigation Act was delivered by the Irish statute of the 14th and 15th of Charles II. ch. 9. to the Irish Custom-house officers, who were required *to cause it to be duly observed and executed.* As far as the navigation of Ireland was employed in carrying on her foreign and coast trade with Britain, and with the rest of Europe, the Navigation Act was entrusted to the care of the Irish officers from that day to the present. When the Irish traders were allowed the American, African, and Levant trade, the shipping, which they thereby employed, were in the same manner delivered by Lord North to the care of the Irish officers. The additional ships, which the opening of the ports must doubtless create, will equally be entrusted to the Irish officers by the Minister who shall carry the proposed arrangements into laws. The objection then, in all its extent, could have been only started by acute disputants, who were studious to oppose, but re-

* P. 46.

gardless of consistency. While the Act of Navigation shall continue to be a fundamental law of Ireland, it must necessarily be entrusted to the execution of the Irish officers, who have thus every motive of interest and duty to act with fidelity and vigour. "Such * reasoning our Author leaves to be refuted by its own absurdity."

The West India planters and merchants having been shewn, that their interest consists in freedom of commerce and universality of markets, are alarmed by our Author with the spectre of smuggling. The Irish, it seems, are to smuggle French sugars from the nearer ports of Ireland to Britain, if these ports shall be opened to them. The Author's opinion amounts to this, that a commerce altogether prohibited affords fewer opportunities to the smuggler than a regulated trade, guarded by reasonable restrictions, and enforced by proper certificates. Mr. Necker thinks very differently from our Author on this subject: a duty †, says this respectable financier, is preferable to an absolute prohibition, as it prevents a great deal of smuggling.

"The controversy would be at an end," says our Commentator ‡, indeed, if the Author of the criticized pamphlet could prove, that it is the interest of Ireland, as it is ours, to prevent the fraudulent importation of Sugars. The duty on Muscovado sugars is 13 $3\frac{1}{2}\frac{3}{4}$ per Cwt. The duty on foreign sugars, which may be distinguished by its package ||,

* P. 46.

† Administration of the Finances, v. II. p. 202—3.

‡ P. 43.

|| Foreign sugars have been condemned on the evidence of the nails.

if not oftēn by its quality, amounts nearly to a prohibition. It is the interest of the fair trader to prevent smuggling. It is the interest of the Custom-house officers to prevent it, as well in Ireland as in Britain, especially in sugar; because, if they were even inclined to be dishonest, the rate of duty is so low, compared with the value of the article, that the fraudulent traders cannot find it an object to corrupt those who are punished severely when they are detected. It is the interest of the Irish administration to punish negligence as well as disobedience in the officer, since no minister wishes to perform the unpleasant task of imposing taxes. And the volunteers of the "thinly inhabited coast of Leinster" have recently turned out to support the Custom-house officers, with an alacrity which has seldom been shewn in any part of England. The controversy, with regard to smuggling, is at an end therefore, by the admission of our Commentator himself.

The West India proprietors, who were at first alarmed by the various arts of party, have, upon mature inquiry, been satisfied, that their interests cannot be materially affected by Irish smuggling. They were easily satisfied, that whatever illicit practices may exist in the West India Islands will be best prevented by acts of their own assemblies. And the West India planters were at length convinced, by motives less mean than those suggested by our Commentator's malignity, that their real interests would be better promoted by enlargement of markets, than they could possibly be injured by the smuggling of a commodity, at once very cumbersome and very wasteful.

"This

" This danger has, however, always existed
 " (according to the report of the Commissioners of
 " the Customs) by the practice of permitting the
 " British West-India produce to come circuitously
 " through the British colonies in North America."
 And, with a wisdom arising from experience, they
 propose, that the same remedy may be applied in
 this case, which has been found to answer in
 others, that West-India goods, when shipped from
 Ireland for Great Britain, shall be accompanied by
 the original certificates, founded on the affidavits
 of the planters. A similar regulation has been
 adopted by the legislature, in respect to wines
 coming from Guernsey, without any ill conse-
 quences having arisen to the revenue.

The littleness of mind which distinguishes the
 advocates of the present opposition, would not
 allow our Commentator to forego a sarcasm on the
 Commutation Tax, the success of which gives them
 many painful sensations. Desperate in their own
 situations, they are rendered still more miserable
 by seeing the country prosper under the foster-
 ing hand of the Minister, who is the constant ob-
 ject of their envy and our Commentator's malignity.
 The produce of the taxes, which has lately been
 laid before parliament, shews very clearly how
 much the revenue has benefited by the reduction
 of the duties on Tea! No industry or arts of the
 enemies to their country will, therefore, be able
 to create or keep up discontents at a measure,
 by which such important advantages have been
 obtained for a nation that had been well nigh ru-
 ined by the measures of our Commentator's friends.

E

Having

Having thus discussed the favourite topic of Smuggling, our Author naturally adverts to fair trade*. In order to shew his idea of the usefulness of averages in commercial calculation, he states the exports of nine years against those of a single year: And to evince his candour he exhibits the trade of the first year of peace, against the traffic of several years of war. The following statement will shew the progress which Ireland has made since the extension of her trade. Of the produce of that country, there was exported in value, according to a three years average, ending with

	To Gr. Britain.	To the British colonies.	To all parts.
1776—	£.2,345,943	— £.248,066	— £.458,076
1783—	£.2,272,645	— £.355,991	— £.424,649

Such is the change which has been produced by Lord North's measure of 1780, according to the accounts from the Irish customs. To Africa and the Levant, Ireland has not yet opened any trade. And from these facts the reader may infer what will be her future progress.

It was a policy recommended by every commercial writer from the reign of king William, and adopted by the parliament †, to cultivate the commerce with our colonies in preference to the trade with foreign countries. It was the policy of late times to open the ports of Ireland to all the world, but to shut them against Great Britain.

* P. 88.

† See the various laws, giving bounties on the importation of Colony produce, in express preference to the commodities of foreign countries.

And it is from this policy that Ireland enjoys at this moment a *right* to trade freely with all Europe and Africa, with America and part of Asia, though her traffic with Britain continues greatly restrained. The word *right* may, perhaps, again provoke our Commentator's reprehension: He reprobates the supposed Secretary for speaking of rights, *conditional* as well as *absolute*: The Irish, according to our Author, have only a *permission* to trade with our colonies: To consider the privileges which the people enjoy under the security of acts of parliament as a mere *permission* which may be withdrawn on the pretence, that conditions have not been performed, our Commentator must have learned in the seminary of his education, or in the school of Mr. Fox. It is not surprizing, then, that the Irish seeing such doctrines propagated by a Right Honourable Writer, and hearing such language from such a party, should fear for their present possessions and desire future security.

In pursuance of the Resolutions of Parliament, in compliance with the loud requests of Ireland, it was adopted as the great principle of the proposed arrangements to conciliate and to unite the Irish with this country, by affection and interest. But, against this fundamental principle, so contrary to that of his party, our Author raises a very violent outcry. WE are to be plundered, according to his moderate language, of whatever could support the credit, the grandeur, and the power of Great Britain*. Union then is to create weakness; the settlement of a distracted empire is

* P. 50.

to lessen its grandeur; and the diffusion of equal industry and commercial confidence is to lessen its credit. Our Commentator's eyes are so jaundiced by his prejudices, that he sees every object through a mist. And in the dark he runs about the nation with a torch in his hand *, careless whether he can extinguish the conflagration, which he is thus active to light up in the capital, in the country, in the empire.

The accusations of such a man carry with them their own confutation. The representations of such a writer ought to be suspected of fallacy. And the reasonings of such a politician ought to be considered as too vehement to be candid, too peremptory to be persuasive, and too prejudiced to be just.

In this moderate spirit our Commentator † gravely asserts, "That ignorance and incapacity have delivered over to Ireland the whole trade of Great Britain, without stipulating any equivalent in return." He proves this incredible charge, by stating, that we send goods amounting to 20,000 l. a year duty-free to Ireland and receive annually no less than the value of 2,000,000 l. duty-free in return. Whether the Right Honourable Gentleman adopted his very candid objection from the newspapers, or the newspapers received it from him, is a question which does not deserve much consideration. One truth is clear, that the whole strain, sentiment, and even language, of our Commentator, may be evidently traced in paragraphs in the newspapers and in essays, which have been diligently circulated through the kingdom.

* See from p. 50 to 59.

† P. 51.

Let us, however, state the fact before we examine the objection. The value of the whole produce of Ireland which was sent to England, according to a three years average, ending with 1783, as stated by the Irish Customhouse, amounted to

£.2,272,645

which included the three great articles of Provisions, Raw Materials, and Linen, imported *duty free*.

Of Provisions,

Bullocks	—	952	£.4,760
Hogs	—	229	229
Beef	—	80,018 Bar.	102,691
Tongues	—	1,129 Doz.	677
Butter	—	131,436 Cwt.	262,872
Pork	—	55,376 Bar.	73,064
Hams	—	299 Cwt.	450
Flitches	—	1,942	485
Hogslard	—	2,688 Cwt.	4,032
Fish	—	—	968
Total of Provisions			£.350,228

Of Raw Materials.

Wool-sheeps	—	2,044 Stones	—	£.1,022		
Yarn	{	Cotton	—	3,524 lbs.	—	176
		Linen	—	33,063 Cwt.	—	198,376
		Woollen	—	777 Stones	—	123
		Worsted	—	77,452 Stones	—	110,678
Tallow	—	35,382 Cwt.	—	70,764		
Hides untanned	—	83,521 N ^o .	—	111,361		
Total of Raw Materials				£.492,500	Of	

Of Linen Cloth.

Cambricks	—	135 Yards	—	£.38	
Plain	—	18,108,958 Yards	—	1,207,263	
Coloured	—	256 Yards	—	20	
Total of Linen Cloth				—	£.1,207,263

The value of the Irish cargo being thus	—	£.2,272,645
The value of articles imported duty-free being	—	2,050,049
The value of Irish <i>duty</i> goods must therefore be	—	222,596

I have in this manner placed our Author's facts in as strong a light as he could wish. Yet, when the particulars are attended to, what do they prove? Nothing against our existing laws, and little against the proposed arrangements.

That the importation of cattle from Ireland was once declared a nuisance by Parliament, is an occurrence which historians have recorded, to mark its folly, or its faction. Salted provisions were also imported, in former times, under prohibitory duties. But the progress of liberality among the country gentlemen and farmers, who, of all descriptions of men in Britain, are, to their honour, the least governed by an avaricious spirit, has at length allowed the importation from Ireland duty-free. It has indeed been remarked by a most judicious writer, *That to hinder the importation of provisions, is to set bounds to the industry and population of a manufacturing Kingdom*: yet our Author would
in-

insinuate, that we were governed, in this measure, by a greater regard to the Irish nation than attention to our own industrious classes. The Irish argue, however, in a very different manner. We have consented, say they, that provisions shall be always sent to you thus, on paying a trifling export duty of about 5 *per cent.* on the value, which will be in some measure injurious to us, and beneficial to you, in two respects; provisions will be thereby something dearer in Ireland, and something cheaper in Britain. And in this manner do the Irish give, and we receive, some equivalent on this head of the proposed arrangements, contrary to our Author's candid suggestions.

It was late in the progress of commercial knowledge that we admitted the importation of any materials of manufacture duty-free. We thus import from Ireland raw materials to the value of half a million, which our manufacturers declare to be very essential to their business. Our own interest then governed the measure of allowing the importation of what we could not well do without. The prohibition of the exportation of our wool to Ireland is to continue, notwithstanding which we have the extensive right of sending our woollen manufactures into that country, as they are prohibited from all the rest of the world;—on the other hand, she gives us the raw materials, both in linen and woollen yarn, with which we carry on our rival manufactures. To procure in this manner raw materials from the Irish, amidst their solicitude for themselves, while we deny them ours, is judiciously considered by our author *, “ as a manifest

* P. 51.

“ proof of the ignorance and incapacity of the
 “ negotiators on the part of Great Britain.”

But, our Author chiefly complains, That we should allow that to continue, which has long existed: That we should permit the Irish to send us linens, duty-free, in preference to those of Germany and Russia. The Irish supply us with plain linen, duty-free: We supply them, in the same unincumbered mode, with fine and figured linens. The principle of the regulation is thus perfectly equal, or rather something in our favour, because we improve the linen fabricks, which we send to them, to a higher state of manufacture; though the benefits of a larger consumption are doubtless on the side of the Irish, who being neither so numerous, nor so rich, cannot consume so much of ours as we do of theirs: Two-thirds of the Irish linen imported are necessarily used at home; because increasing as our manufacture is, it cannot supply enough for ourselves: One-third is exported, as part of the miscellaneous cargoes which our extensive traders send to every market: A tax on the import of an article of necessary consumption must be paid by the consumer, without injuring the maker: Such a tax must be drawn back on the exportation, or we should lose the profit of the foreign sale. This principle, however, our Author warmly declares * “ to be partial, unjust, “ and ruinous,” without considering to what an extent our export trade is increased by the small bounties paid on the low-priced linens.

It is surely of importance to trace minutely the operation of the principle which is thus censured

* P. 51.

as “ unjust and ruinous;” because the proposed arrangements, being framed on a principle analogous to it, must stand or fall with the result of our inquiries. The sister kingdoms seem to have enjoyed each a linen manufacture from the earliest ages. With a view to revenue, perhaps more than to regulation, the Irish parliament imposed * at the Restoration an excise and custom of twelve shillings for every hundred ells of *British* linen which should be thereafter imported into Ireland. During those days of monopoly Irish linen could not be imported into England. It was first permitted by the 7 and 8 of King William III †, “ for “ encouraging the linen manufacture of Ireland,” upon a recital, that great sums of money had been yearly exported for the purchasing of hemp, flax, and linen, which might be prevented in a great measure, by a supply from Ireland. To encourage Irish linens, and to discourage those of foreign countries, was the ruling principle of this act, which has continued in force, without complaint, to the present times. While the disputes about the Union were depending, Scotch linen was prohibited ‡ by an English act from being sent into Ireland. And it was not till the 4th George I. that British linen was allowed || to enter into competition with the Irish, by being admitted duty-free into Ireland. From a period, favourable to freedom, the commerce of linen between the sister kingdoms has been perfectly unrestrained, and

* By 14, 15 Ch. II. ch. 8, 9.

† Ch. 39.

‡ By 3 and 4 An. ch. 8.

|| By Irish 4 Geo. I. ch. 6.

the manufacturers of both have been the supporters, rather than the rivals of each other.

Were we to argue, with our Author, in favour of monopoly, we ought to presume, that the infant manufacture of Irish linen must have sustained an irreparable injury, in 1718, from the unqualified importation of Scots and English linens: We know, however, from experience, that no such blow was given, and that no such destruction followed. Few manufactures have ever grown from small beginnings to perfection with quicker steps than the Irish linens, since the commencement of competition; as the candid reader may learn from the following statement. Of linen cloth there were exported from Ireland, according to a three years average,

ending with 1716	—	yards 2,176,499
ending with 1736	—	6,240,353
ending with 1756	—	12,471,654
ending with 1776	—	19,208,116

While the export of the Irish linens thus increased to that vast amount, and in some subsequent years to a still greater; while the Irish found their best market in Britain; the British linens increased nearly in the same proportion. We may learn this animating truth from a consideration of the augmented quantity of the raw materials brought in, besides great quantities raised under the bounties lately granted by Parliament; from the increased quantity of British linens exported, or made for sale; and from the diminished value of foreign linens at different times imported*.

* Report of the linen committee.

Of linen yarn there were imported.

in 1757	—	lbs. 1,644,553
in 1771	—	3,943,322
in 1772-3-4 *	—	lbs. 11,343,585
in 1780-1-2	—	17,851,439

We shall perhaps be told that some of this is used in the cotton manufacture; the proportion is, however, very small since the spinning of cotton has been brought to such perfection by Mr. Arkwright's machines.

The increase of the manufacture of British linens may be inferred, 2dly, from the quantity exported, after supplying the demands of the home market.

Of British linens receiving bounty, there were exported from England,

in 1743	—	yards 52,779
in 1753	—	641,510
in 1763	—	2,308,310
in 1773	—	5,235,266
in 1783	—	8,873,092

Of British sail cloth there were also exported,

in 1743	—	yards 121,374
in 1753	—	549,446
in 1763	—	962,316
in 1773	—	1,135,566
in 1783	—	1,596,328

Of the rise, or decline, of the linen manufacture of Scotland, we can more certainly determine, from the registers kept of the quantity stamp'd annually

* Custom-house account.

for sale, which is but a part of what is made there. Little was probably manufactured for export prior to the year 1727, when the linen of Scotland received some additional encouragements. There were stamp for sale,

in 1724	(about)	2,000,000 yards.
in 1734	—	4,746,826
in 1744	—	5,840,727
in 1754	—	8,914,369
in 1764	(about)	12,000,000
in 1774	—	11,422,115
in 1782	—	15,348,744
in 1783	—	17,074,777
in 1784	—	19,138,593

To such a point of greatness has the linen manufacture of Scotland risen, in half a century, notwithstanding every competition and some temporary checks, from the state of credit and circulation, which equally affected the English manufacture, about the years 1773 and 1774. Whether we contemplate then the increased quantity of linen yarn imported; the increased quantity of British linen and hempen cloth exported; or the vast additions annually made to the number of yards stamp for sale in Scotland; we must be satisfied, that the linen manufacture of Britain is in a most flourishing state, though the principles of equal competition, under which it flourishes, is condemned by our Author "as ruinous."

Were any confirmation of this agreeable truth necessary, we might derive additional proofs from considering how much the importation of foreign linens has diminished, as our own manufacture has increased. Of foreign linens there were imported

into England *, according to a five years average,		
ending with 1756,	— yards	31,561,537
ending with 1761,	—	28,334,821
ending with 1766,	—	24,815,364
ending with 1771,	—	24,988,477

The linen manufacturers, who came up to parliament, in 1773, to complain of the ruin of their business, attributed that ruin indeed to the increased importation of foreign linens. They did not perceive that almost all their distresses arose from an obstructed circulation, which grew out of the suspected credit of those bankrupt times. And they called for a new duty on foreign linens, as the best remedy for a disease which did not really exist. But, neither the complainants, nor the Woollen manufacturers, who opposed their desires, because they feared the retaliation of foreign courts, objected to the encouragement that for eighty years had been given the Irish linens, as the cause of the jealousy of other countries. The Board of Trade, at which sat Lord Carlisle and Mr. Eden, attributed the augmented import of Irish linens, and the diminished import of foreign †, “to the accumulated duties on foreign linens, notwithstanding such duties are said to have operated to the prejudice of our own woollen trade, by inducing foreign powers to lay reciprocal burdens on it.” But, the Board of Trade do not, like our Author, assign as a cause of foreign retaliation, that, by a law of King William’s reign, we had given special encouragement to the

* Report of the Linen Committee.

† Linen Report of 1780.

Irish linens in declared preference to that of other countries. Foreign powers did not complain, at least we did not much dread their complaints, when we gave encouragements to our colony produce in preference to theirs, from the reign of Queen Anne to the present time. Nor can they complain of the avowed preference given to the productions of our fellow-subjects, which is only continued at the end of ninety years, but is not now begun.

This preference must be retained, whatever our Author has said in paragraphs, or in his pamphlet; otherwise, many of our own manufactures would be undone. Let us take the example of iron:—are the iron-masters prepared with all their improvements and their skill to continue their important works without a duty on foreign iron? They will tell our Author that they are not; and will probably add, that they are little obliged to him for attempting to raise a jealousy, which may produce mischief, but can do no good. Our Author had so fine an opportunity, however, of involving the nation in a dilemma with the European powers, or with Ireland, that his prudence could not resist his malignity, whatever might be the consequence of foreign or of civil war.

Having endeavoured to point out the ruinous tendency of the general principle of the proposed arrangements, contrary to facts, to experience, and to the decisive experience of sixty years, our Commentator proceeds with his usual moderation to censure the mode: the Resolutions had been transmitted to Ireland*, it seems, long before the Committee

* P. 52.

of Council had been appointed to meet: The evidence appeared too late for any wise or prudent purposes. The Resolutions, which were thus sent, contain, whatever may be their number, one ruling principle, that a *free* and *equal* trade must be for the mutual benefit and lasting advantage of the sister kingdoms. The truth of the general position had been often discussed before the public. The opinions of every considerable man, in both countries, had been settled, as to its truth and wisdom. The Parliament had sanctioned the utility of the measure, by resolving on the motion of those who now oppose the execution of it, "that the connection between the two kingdoms ought to be established by mutual consent on a permanent basis."—It required, therefore, no additional evidence to illustrate or support a principle, which had thus been justified by private approbation, and confirmed by public authority.

But, to carry into practice the principle of an *equal trade* required the information of professional men, who, being best acquainted with the minute particulars of their own affairs, could best point out the various modifications which an equality of trade requires. In order to gain this information, two questions were submitted to the Committee of Council: 1st, Whether, in prudence, the duties payable in Britain, on the import of Irish products, could be reduced to the rate payable on the importation of British goods, of the same kind, imported into Ireland? 2dly, Whether it would be the interest of Britain to continue the preferences, whatever they might be, which are now allowed to Ireland, in opposition to similar articles of foreign growth? And the
Com-

Committee of Council assembled time enough to gain the necessary information for answering both these questions, important as they are. The Committee approved of the general plan, "that certain moderate duties should be imposed on the importation of the goods, the manufacture of each other, so as to secure a preference in the home market to the like articles of their own growth; and at the same time leave the sister kingdom advantages, though not equal to its own, yet superior to those granted to any foreign country." Such are the great outlines of the proposed arrangements: And the Committee of Council give it as their opinion, "That the duties now payable on British goods, imported into Ireland, are, by their moderation, as well adapted to answer this purpose as could be devised."

With the result of this inquiry our Author appears to be extremely dissatisfied. He did not expect, that, in a case where the prejudices of the manufacturers were much more likely to govern them than their real interests, they would generally speak with so much distinctness, moderation, and liberality: And he exults, that a body of manufacturers, called together at a tavern, for the purpose of working on their prejudices, should contradict and condemn what any one had said and approved before the Committee of Council. With his usual decency he censures the Privy Counsellors for confining the inquiry to the only object, which could be considered: For, they knew, "That Ireland as well as Great Britain *has already a right* to supply its own market, and the markets of foreign countries, with any goods of its manufactures, subject
" only

“ only to such duties and restrictions as its own legislature shall think proper to impose.” And they judged it to be little consistent with their duty, though their forbearance does not gratify our Author, to inquire how much the Irish are likely to rival the British manufacturers in the European or American markets, to which they had been admitted by the party for which he is an apologist. They probably thought with Mr. Eden, that it is inconsistent with practical wisdom

To mourn a mischief that is past and gone.

Having, however, censured this examination “ as partial and limited,” the interrogatories “ as insidious,” and the evidence “ as unsatisfactory,” our Author, with a happy consistency, retails this evidence to the public, through three and twenty pages. However tedious the task may be, and however dull, the interests of truth require, that we should follow him, in order to rectify his mis-statements, to detect his misrepresentations, and to establish real facts in the place of intended errors. In order to which we will follow him in his own order.

S I L K S.

This is not an Irish manufacture of long standing; nor is it a flourishing one. We may infer thus much from the quantity both of raw and manufactured silk, which the demands of that country

required. Of both there were imported, according to a three years average, ending

		Raw	manufactured
		lb.	lb.
with	1754	— 51,308	— 14,485
with	1764	— 49,294	— 20,735
with	1774	— 42,028	— 15,949
with	1784	— 37,015	— 20,895

Can there be a more convincing proof adduced, that the silk manufactory does not flourish in Ireland; unless we except indeed the late evidence of the journeymen silk-weavers before the House of Commons? Among others, Boulger artlessly told the committee, That he had left his own country, because the silk manufactures were there quite at a stand; that after being several months out of work in Ireland, he had got immediate employ in Spitalfields; and that a *shilling* will go farther in a poor man's maintenance in London, than *fourteen pence* in Dublin, where lodgings are not so reasonable as in London. This man's plain story made a greater impresson on the committee than the studied evidence of Messrs. Peele, Walker, and others.

Our sagacious Commentator has, however, discovered, that, when the ports of Ireland were opened, the Irish exported silks; that in 1783, a year of peace, they sent out a larger quantity than in 1782, a year of war; while their own consumption was chiefly supplied from Britain. But the question is not what they send to other countries, to which they have now a right to trade; but what they are likely to send to this country; the Irish goods being loaded with duties to countervail the British ones,

toget-

together with the charges of freight, insurance, and factorage. The Irish it seems will not in future send their silk and other manufactures to those markets, wherein they may meet us on equal terms; but it is inculcated by our Author, and feared by his deluded followers, that the Irish will work for the British markets alone, wherein they must pay duties, besides 3 per cent. for charges of importation. He contends, that the Irish, from the shortness of the voyage, may send their goods to the West Indies and America on better terms than the British: yet he confidently tells us, that the *Irish will involve Great Britain in ruin*, by supplying her home market, though burdened with a greater charge, than any manufacturer can hope to gain by his business.

The most judicious writers calculate the usual profit of manufacture at double the interest of money. The profit in Britain ought therefore to be ten per cent.; the profit in Ireland must consequently be twelve per cent.: And before the Irish can dispose of their manufactures in the British market, there must be an advance on the first cost of three per cent. more than the reasonable profit. Yet our Author wisely argues, that the Irish will resort to the British markets in preference to those of the rest of the world, where, he says, they can sell even on lower terms. And this deep observation he is particularly anxious to have remembered through the whole of his reasoning.

Ireland has been hitherto supplied in a great measure from Britain with manufactured and even with raw silk. The Irish have formerly employed about fifteen hundred silk manufacturers, who reside chiefly in Dublin. They cannot from this cir-

cumstance manufacture so cheap as the same goods are made in Britain, as Boulger informed the House of Commons, and as the manufacturers themselves confessed to the committee of council. Yet they still thought, that the English manufacturer would have great reason to apprehend the competition of the Irish for two reasons; the British pay duties on the import of dying stuffs; the Irish have the raw silk at a lower price. With regard to the first, the manufacturers were certainly in an error; they must have mistaken the duties on the exportation of dying materials for duties on the importation. And they were perhaps as much mistaken, in supposing that the Irish having the raw materials at a lower duty than we have them gives them every advantage in coming to this market, because their manufactures must be loaded with additional duties to countervail that;—nor does it give them the smallest advantage over our manufactures in a foreign market, as there are bounties on our silk goods exported to compensate fully for the duty on the raw material; the Irish can therefore derive no benefit from their low duty but for their own consumption, a great part of which we do and must continue to supply.

The manufacturers who were heard before the Committee of Council, complained of the Dublin Society for giving bounties to their tradesmen, and were apprehensive that there would be great quantities of foreign Silks smuggled through Ireland into Britain. Experience seems, however, to have decided against the reasonableness of their fears in both cases. The Dublin Society first erected their silk warehouse in 1765; yet, from that time to the present (as we have seen) the im-
port

port of raw silk has decreased, while the amount of the manufactured silk carried thither has increased. If smuggling has been reduced to a system, can we suppose, that the smugglers to effect their purposes will take two voyages instead of one; will run a double risque to land their foreign silks, when a single risque would bring them to shore? or will venture into Ireland, where the manufacturers are active in detecting the enemies of the fair trader, and where manufactured silks cannot be removed from place to place without permits, when they may land their goods on some of the neighbouring coasts of England, where meeting with associates in the same cause they may hope to escape detection?

With his usual confidence our Commentator challenges the supposed Secretary *to point out what article of manufacture the Irish buy in Britain, which they can get cheaper in any other country.* Manufactured silk is one article, and woollen cloth another. The Irish parliament have imposed a duty of $\text{£.}3\ 15s. 2d.$ per pound weight* on wrought silks imported, *except from Great Britain.* And wrought silk might be imported cheaper from Italy and France; woollen cloths we have already shewn are excluded by prohibitory duties; and 10 per cent. has lately been laid on various commodities not imported from Britain. Thus our Commentator's confidence leads to that conviction of his own ignorance, which he laboured to fix on the objects of his envy.

From the article of silks our Commentator, however, proceeds triumphantly to the great business

* Eaton's book of Rates, p. 145. 9 Geo. II. ch. 2.

OF WOOLLENS.

IT is doubtless true, that *this has always been the great article of jealousy in this nation* till the present moment; because this vast source of our opulence has been carefully guarded by the proposed arrangements, and properly understood by those who are the most interested in its preservation. From the Revolution to this day, no wool in its manufactured state could be exported from this kingdom. No wool or woollen manufacture could be exported from Ireland, except to Great Britain, since the reign of king William: Wool, worsted and woollen yarn, have been long exportable from Ireland, and importable into this nation, duty-free. The British manufactures of wool could be sent into Ireland, on payment of very trifling duties, while foreign woollens are excluded: The Irish manufactures of wool could be imported into Great Britain, on paying prohibitory duties. The intended arrangements propose no other change, in the article of woollens, than to admit the Irish woollen manufactures into this country, on paying the same duties which have long been paid on the British woollens in Ireland. The Irish parliament, in this session, have already rejected the measure of prohibiting the exportation of worsted yarn, which our manufacturers say is a very essential article; and which they will, therefore, continue to have duty-free: on the other hand, we deny the Irish our wool on any terms: They only desire, in return, that the
woollen

woollen manufactures of the two kingdoms may be admitted into each other, on paying equal duties, but mutually subjected to the extra charge of freight, insurance, and factorage.

Our Commentator's design has led him, however, to misrepresent what he could not deny. He asserts* boldly, in the face of an act of parliament †, *that the new duties to be paid on Irish woollen yarn will be extremely prejudicial to the stuff manufacturers*, because they cannot procure a sufficient quantity of English. It is impossible that *new* duties can take place, under the proposed arrangements, in a case where *old* duties did not exist before on either side. The statute just quoted removed all duties from the exportation of worsted yarn to England, although that article cannot be exported from Great Britain to Ireland. And it is but common justice to the Minister, to suppose he will guard against any innovation, in this respect, in the final arrangement of the business.

No, says our Author ‡, in the same strain of candour, it is of no commercial consequence to any country, whether its produce is sent out at the price of two shillings or of twenty. He reprobates the supposed Secretary for stating, that the old drapery, being of the value of 14s. a yard, and the new drapery of 2s. 6d. the old was a more advantageous manufacture to Ireland than the new. Till our Author enlightened the world with his Reply, it was universally acknowledged, that a country was enriched in proportion as its manufactures were worked to perfection; because every

* P. 58—9.

† Irish act, 3 Geo. II. ch. 3.

‡ P. 57.

new operation requires additional labour, which produces still more employment and profit. Hence has it been an object of anxious policy, for ages in Britain, to manufacture highly every fleece of her wool. And hence we may judge of the value of that equivalent which Ireland gives, when she permits us to work up so much of her raw materials, even for her own consumption.

But our Commentator has discovered, from the Custom-house accounts in the News-papers, that the export of Irish woollens have greatly increased since 1780. The door was then opened by his friends; and the Irish availed themselves of this favourable circumstance: The peace was made at the end of 1782; and the Irish sent their goods to such markets as had till then been hostile to them. The Irish looms have, by these events, been set to work; and they have been more employed since they were free than before. These are doubtless discoveries worthy of our Author's sagacity: But, he contends for the honour of a still greater discovery: That the Irish traders will not send their woollen goods to those markets where they may meet on equal terms with British woollens, nay, on better, according to him; but, with a spirit peculiar to themselves, will alone trade in that market wherein their goods must necessarily come charged with a duty and other consequent expences of freight, commission, and factorage, on the first cost, which amount to the profit of the manufacturer.

It is unnecessary to litigate a point, which has been already decided by the proper judges. The manufacturers of Norwich, of Yorkshire, and Wilts, declared to the committee of council, with

a commendable spirit of candour and liberality, that they were under no apprehensions of the competition of the Irish in the home market, while they themselves were allowed the exclusive manufacture of the raw material, as they had always been:—That, as to foreign markets, it would ill become them, even by their wishes, to deprive fellow-subjects of natural advantages. The woollen manufacturers have since considered the proposed arrangements: and they have again declared, that their interests cannot be materially affected by the competition of the manufactured goods; while the advantage of the raw material will remain solely to Great Britain. But our Commentator, with his accustomed decency, censures * their reasons “as absurd”—and condemns their conduct, “as allowing party to outweigh self-interest.” Few men argue absurdly against their private interests to public predilections. And the woollen manufacturers of the Western counties were too prudent to gratify Mr. Wedgwood’s passion for politics, at the hazard of provoking Irish retaliation: they saw, that by opposing the arrangements, in order to please a party, they might probably lose, but could not possibly gain. From this discussion of woollens, we may now proceed with our Author to the Article

* P. 61—2.

O F R E F I N E D S U G A R.

He on this head of his subject blames the supposed secretary, not so much for what the text has said, as for what it ought to have said. Our Commentator admits, that though the Irish will not be able to supply the British market with refined sugar, they may send it molasses. Whatever the text, or the commentary may say, the proper judges have determined the point of policy in favour of the arrangements. The sugar bakers are perfectly satisfied with the countervailing duties, which the Irish have laid. And under the protection of such duties the refiners determined, that the proposed system would not injure the British trade.

But, says our Commentator, the importation of molasses at a low price will necessarily sink the value in Britain, and encourage the distillery of molasses, to the prejudice of the malt distillery. He is again entangled in his absurdity of supposing, that a *circuitous* voyage brings the commodity the *cheapest* to market. If the traders can gain by the importation of molasses, they will bring them *directly* from the West Indies, and not from Ireland. The high duty on the importation will sufficiently protect the malt-distillery. And our Author might have known, that it is one of the greatest difficulties of political œconomy to reduce the prices, which have once been high. From his contradictory remarks on sugar, our Commentator proceeds triumphantly to

C O T T O N.

“ If Ireland has profited so much, says he, with his usual artifice, by a distant trade, which is but in its infancy, what may we not dread from her having a near market opened to her, where she will have so many advantages.” Whether Ireland has profited so much by her American trade; whether Manchester, which has sent cargoes to an almost incredible extent to America since the peace, is likely to gain more, when she shall receive remittances; are questions which need not here be discussed. The Irish doubtless profited from the opening of their ports in 1780: They sent out still greater cargoes, as the British traders have always done, when the return of peace offered larger markets. And the British and Irish merchants have an equal right to appear on equal terms in foreign countries: The British have a right too to supply Ireland, as they have hitherto done, on paying a duty of $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the value, with charges of importation, amounting to about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more: And it is proposed to allow the Irish to send their Cotton manufactures to Britain, on paying the same duties, with the Excise (where an Excise exists) and charges of importation.

The Irish (according to the suggestion of our Author) are to relinquish the market, wherein they have now a right to appear on equal terms, and to find their principal sales in the market wherein they must pay an unequal duty and charges to a

greater amount than the full profit on the goods. This is the question, which our Author presumes, but does not prove: yet this is the only question which he ought to have proved.

If the reasonable profit of manufacture is admitted to be double interest of money, every parcel of British goods, on which £100. had been expended, must come to the British market at £110.

On the other hand,

The Irish first cost and profit must be	£112	0	0
Tax $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.	—	11	15 6
Charges $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.	—	2	16 0
		<hr/>	
		126	11 6
		<hr/>	

In this view of the subject, the British manufacturer can afford to undersell the Irish in the British market £.16 11s. 6d. for every £100. first cost of goods. And when an excise is paid, they can undersell the Irish competitors still more; though our Author will have it, indeed *, that when Irish excised goods are sold, the consumer will pay the tax; but when the British excited goods are disposed of, the consumer will not!

In opposition to this satisfactory statement, our Commentator appeals to “the decisive evidence” of the cotton manufacturers, who were examined by the Committee of Council, and by the House of Commons. It is ridiculous to speak of evidence given by persons on the faith of mere common report; let us appeal rather to the evidence since given to the House of Commons by persons who carried on the cotton manufacture in Ireland,

* P. 70.

and are come back to this country, to cross the water no more :—they could have no predilection for Ireland, or her interests; and they proved to absolute demonstration, that the people of that country carry on the cotton manufacture, and ever must, from immutable circumstances, to much more disadvantage than we do:—some manufacturers, of which number these witnesses were a part, were under the same delirium in 1780, when the Irish ports were opened, which some are under now : They went over to that country in hopes of carrying on a profitable trade; a few who went with them died broken-hearted, and from actual want. Subscriptions were raised in Manchester, and its neighbourhood, to enable others to return; and the remainder are still in Ireland, indebted to their masters, and confined thereby to their service.

Cotton wool the Irish may doubtless obtain from all the places of its growth, though, perhaps, not on better terms; but they have as yet chiefly imported it from Britain. They find here a credit which they have not at Smyrna, or Demeraray; though for this credit they must pay an advance on the price. In proportion as manufacturers are poor, they require a longer credit, which creates a greater risque: and this longer credit and greater risque the merchant never fails to consider in settling the price of the commodity. In fact, cotton wool is generally dearer in Ireland than in England, from 2*d.* to 2½ per pound. And the Irish are, moreover, subjected to the inconvenient unsteadiness of price, which always prevails in narrow markets. This is the true cause that cotton wool is always dearer in France than in Britain. The cotton warps, which are now spun by machinery,

thinery, are generally imported from Britain, and are dearer in Ireland, nearly in the same proportion, as linen warps are cheaper. The British warps are sold in the Irish market, after adding the charges of importation, upon as good terms as the Irish-spun warps. The country, which, being itself a manufacturing country, furnishes its neighbour with the raw material, must surely have no small advantage.

The low wages of labour in Ireland; the lower price of labour in Ireland as five shillings a week are to eight; are the facts, or rather the mis-statements, on which the manufacturers have grounded both their calculations and clamours. These mis-statements furnish the chief argument against the proposed arrangements. And it may be proper therefore to inquire minutely how the fact really stands.

The wages of common labourers are certainly higher in England than in Ireland. Mechanics are as amply paid in the one country as in the other. But, in every species of weaving (except in plain linen) the Irish weaver earns more money in proportion to the work done than the English. In the cotton manufacture (for example), in Dublin, sixpence a yard is paid for weaving a 45 beer callico: whereas, in England, the average price of such manufacture is not quite three-pence. The well-known rates established at Dublin for workmanship are higher than at Manchester. This circumstance induced the Irish to plant their cotton manufacture at Prosperous, on the border of the Bog of Allen. Here they established *nominally* the Lancashire prices: but there are so many indulgences given of house rent and machinery, and the work

work performed by the men for their wages is so much less, that the price of labour at Prosperous, and at other cotton manufactories in Ireland, is, in fact, much higher than it is in England. A working printer of linens, or cottons, is paid in Ireland a guinea a week, which is the usual price in England when the men work by the week; but when the printers work on task by the piece they are paid higher wages in Ireland than in Lancashire. And this last fact the manufacturers themselves acknowledged to the Committee of Council.

In order to confirm these facts, and to leave no room for doubt in any one's mind, a comparative statement of the prices, at which cottons can be manufactured in Britain and Ireland, framed upon an accurate attention to the respective prices of the raw materials and labour in both countries, is now subjoined for the public satisfaction.

No. I. The Lowest Species of IRISH FUSTIAN,
30 Yards each piece, at $9\frac{3}{4}d.$ a Yard.

		Irish Money.
Linen warp	— 6s.	} £0 12 9
$4\frac{1}{2}$ lb. Smyrna cotton wool at 18d.	— 6s. 9d.	
Weaving 30 yards at $2\frac{1}{2}d.$	—	0 6 3
Spinning $4\frac{1}{2}$ lb. cotton at 10d.	—	0 3 9
Dying and finishing	—	0 1 9
First cost	—	<hr/> £1 4 6

BRITISH FUSTIAN.

		Irish Money.
Raw material	_____	£ 0 12 9
Labour	— — —	0 9 3
		<hr/>
		£ 1 2 0

The linen yarn being cheaper in Ireland than in England, and the cotton dearer, the raw material is stated in the above calculations as equal in both countries; the advantage on the yarn being supposed sufficient to counterbalance the disadvantage on the cotton. We here see the cause why the export of fustians to Ireland should have rather declined, owing to the difference of 10 per cent. in the price of linen yarn.

No. II. IRISH CALLICO; 28 Yards in the Piece; price 1s. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. a yard.

		Irish Money.
Raw material, West India Cotton 9 lb.	_____	} £ 0 18 0
at 2s.	—	
Spinning the warp	_____	0 8 7
Spinning the weft	_____	0 7 6
Weaving	_____	0 14 0
Bleaching	— —	0 1 9
		<hr/>
First cost	_____	£ 2 9 10

BRITISH CALLICO.

English warp	—	£0 15 0
West	—	0 16 8
Weaving	—	0 8 0
Bleaching	—	0 1 9
		<hr/>
First cost	—	£2 1 5

However extraordinary, it is yet a fact, that stating the weaving of a 45 beer callico at the highest price paid in England, viz. 8s. at the lowest paid in Dublin, on a very late reduction, the difference of weaving is no less than six shillings.

No. III. Half Ell IRISH KING CARD, mixed linen and cotton, 36 yards, at 2s. 4d. each.

		Irish Money.
5 lb. linen yarn at 2s.	—	£0 10 0
13 lb. West India wool at 2s.		1 6 0
Spinning	—	0 13 0
Weaving 7½ per yard	—	1 2 6
Finishing, cutting, dying, &c.	—	0 12 0
		<hr/>
		£4 3 6

BRITISH KING CARD.

		Irish Money.
5 lb. linen yarn	—	£0 11 0
13 lb. wool at 1s. 10d.	—	1 3 10
Spinning and weaving at 2s. 2d. per lb.		1 8 2
Finishing	—	0 12 0
		<hr/>
		£3 15 0
	I	The

The manufacture of this article has increased greatly during these few years, particularly in Dublin; and the annexed prices are perfectly understood and determined.

No. IV. KING's CARD, with Cotton Warp,
26 beers, 38 Yards.

	Irish Money:
Established price of warp ready for the loom	} £1 1 8
13½ lb. cotton wool at 2s.	— 1 7 0
Spinning	— 0 13 6
Weaving at 8d.	— 1 5 4
Finishing	— 0 12 0
First cost	£4 19 6

British KING's CARD.

	Irish Money:
Price of the warp in England at the highest	} £0 18 4
13½ lb. cotton at 1s. 10d.	— 1 4 9
Spinning and weaving at 2s. 2d.	— 1 9 3
Finishing	— 0 12 0
First cost	£4 4 4

This article too has increased in Ireland; and the prices are accurately stated, and perfectly understood.

No. V. IRISH $\frac{1}{2}$ ELL VELVERET, all
Cotton, 38 Yards.

			Irish Money.
Warp	—————	—	£1 1 8
16 lb. wool at 2s.		—	1 12 0
Spinning	—————	—————	0 16 0
Weaving at 9d.	—	—	1 8 6
Finishing	—————	—————	1 7 2
			<hr/>
First cost	—	—	£6 5 4

BRITISH VELVERET.

			Irish Money.
Warp	—	—	£0 18 4
16 lb. of wool at 1s. 10d.		—	1 9 4
Weaving and spinning at 2s. 2d. per lb.			1 14 8
Finishing	—————	—————	1 2 2
			<hr/>
First cost	—————	—————	£5 4 6

The cutting, dying, finishing of velverets, are cheaper in England than in Ireland; which, with the difference in other branches of the labour, make thus a difference of 20s. in one piece of velveret. And to these articles of expence might have been added coals, which are three times as high in price at Prosperous as at Manchester, and yet are a very essential article in the cotton manufacture.

Such, then, is the result of these accurate statements, which, on every trial, demonstrate how much cheaper the cotton manufacture is carried on in Britain than in Ireland. If the manufacturers, who have formed very different calculations, cannot

point out any material inaccuracy, we must infer, that they have been too hasty to be accurate, and have taken their information too much from common report.

The foregoing statements, founded as they are on the actual situation of the business, will surely have proper weight with every well-meaning mind. On those who object to the intended arrangements in the whole, because they hope to gain from confusion, they will probably have little influence. Our Author will continue to think *,
 “ That the opening of the British market to Ire-
 “ land will have an *immediate effect* from the ad-
 “ vanced state to which the cotton manufacture has
 “ already attained in Ireland; and that the Irish
 “ can draw immediately for a great part of the
 “ amount of their goods.” All this is much more easily said than proved. That the settlement of these arrangements, and with them of commercial quiet between the sister kingdoms, will have an *immediate effect*, is certainly true. There will be a great export of British manufactures, because conditional orders are already arrived, as Mr. Everet informed the Committee of Council. But, that a country which has not yet supplied its own markets should at once supply the very people who have hitherto over-stocked their warehouses, is a position which may be left to the self-conviction of its own absurdity. It has been positively asserted, that Mr. Peele, who gave evidence at the bar of the House of Commons, of the danger of the Irish pouring in their cotton manufactures here, under all the disadvantages which have been stated, does himself continue to send large quantities of cal-

* P. 71.

licoës to Belfast, where there is the largest manufacture of those articles in the kingdom; certain it is, that great assortments do continue to be sent there cheaper after the payment of duties and charges than they can be manufactured in Ireland.

Yet, our Author continues to think, that the delay and expence of carriage to London will be little more to the Irish than to the Lancashire manufacturer. From Prosperous it will be almost as easy (according to our Author) to fill the London warehouses as by the daily coach, by the weekly waggon, or by the various navigations, coast-ways and internal, which so commodiously connect Manchester with every part of the kingdom as well as with the East sea by the Trent, and with the West by the Mersey.

Under all these disadvantages, and with such prospects before them, our manufacturers are to emigrate with their capital, their stock, and their workmen, with Mr. Peele at their head, to make cottons, not for foreign countries, but for Great Britain. Mr. Peele will do well to consider the foregoing statements, which he will find somewhat more accurate than his own, before he carries his incautious threat into final execution.

From cotton, which is certainly one of the most flourishing of our manufactures, we may proceed with our author to

L E A T H E R*.

The policy of the sister kingdoms with regard to this article, has hitherto been directly the reverse of each other. Hides *untanned* cannot be exported from this country. Ireland has generally sent out two-thirds of hers in the raw state owing to the want of bark †. We, who have that article in plenty, commonly import from Ireland about 80,000 hides undressed. Leather, in its manufactured state, may be now imported from Ireland on paying 77 *per cent.* of the value: We may send leather manufactured to Ireland on paying 10½ *per cent.* And the proposed arrangements would admit the Irish into this country on paying the lower duty over and above all our duties of Excise. But our Author asks, by which of the Resolutions are they to pay this duty, and what is the amount? The answer is under the 4th Resolution; and, according to Eaton's rates, the duty is 11d. $\frac{6}{20}$ $\frac{4}{5}$ on each tanned hide which stands rated at 10s. Our Author furnishes so many instances of confident ignorance or wilful misstatement, that we ought to distrust him everywhere. Failing altogether in argument, he asserts at once ‡, “ that there is not an article more essentially en-

* P. 72.

† It was proved at the Bar of the House of Commons, by a person who sells large quantities of bark annually both in England and Ireland, that the price of that article is upon an average 6l. a ton in the latter, when it is 4l. in the former.

‡ P. 72.

“dangered by the new system than this of leather.” We may safely trust the prosperity of the leather manufactures to the advantage we have over the Irish in a constant and plentiful supply of bark, and to the duties on Importation with the duties of Excise added to them, to which our own manufactures are subject, and to the superior skill and capital of our tanners. The increase of revenue on leather alone evinces, that this is a very flourishing manufacture, which may be invigorated, but cannot be lessened by the competition of a rival one, loaded with so great a duty and so many charges.

From leather, which our author pertinaciously urges, will be sent to a market, where it must be loaded with taxes and charges to the amount of 13 *per cent.* rather than to markets where the competition will be equal, We may without fear proceed to

SOAP AND CANDLES.

These are articles which are doubtless very worthy of our care, whether we regard them as objects of commerce or of revenue. Notwithstanding the free and equal competition of the Irish in foreign markets, the export of these articles appears from the Custom-house books to have varied little during the last seven years, and to be now considerable. Thus, though the Irish exports to America have increased, the British trade to that country in the same articles seems not to have diminished.

minished. But, according to our Author's new theory of commerce, the moment that the duties on the imports from Ireland are lowered to the standard of the Irish import duties, the Irish traders will quit an equal market and try a competition in an equal one. They will no longer send their soap and candles to those markets where they may sell, on paying equal duties, but they will only traffic in Great Britain where they must pay an import duty of 5*s.* 10*d.* $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{5}$ the hundred weight on candles, and 9*s.* 5*d.* $\frac{1}{2}$ the hundred weight on soap, besides the excise duties peculiar to this country. And, if we may believe the manufacturers themselves, the Irish goods are not so well manufactured as British; yet, according to our author* "the new system will completely annihilate the sale of British soap and candles." Such wild assertions carry with them their own refutation. The countervailing duties will amount to a good deal more than the complete profit on the first cost of the goods. The Irish must, therefore, have two whole profits on their goods, before they can undersel the British in the home market. The Irish have not yet driven the British from the foreign markets, wherein they pay no countervailing duties; and they consequently cannot undersel the British in our own markets, in which they must pay import as well as excise duties, with the charges attending the consignment, before they can commence a competition.

Leaving our Author then entangled in his own theory, and bewildered with the contradictions of

* P. 73.

his own witnesses on the subject of soap and candles*, we shall proceed to consider what he says on the important subject

O F I R O N.

Our Author sees this head of the proposed arrangements with still more prejudiced eyes:—“Under the new system we can have no security (according to him †) for the *British* market, as there is nothing provided that can make Ireland increase her duties either on importation or exportation.” By discussing the subject of iron, in the general, without dividing the complicated business into its several parts, designing men have raised alarms without the smallest foundation for them in truth.

The great iron works of this country are carried on by two distinct classes of men; by the iron *masters*, and by the iron *manufacturers*, whose interests are different, and who are consequently competitors with each other. The capital of the iron masters is employed in converting the *ore* into *pigs*, the *pigs* into bars, and the bars into various scantlings, by slitting and rolling, for the various uses of the manufacturer. The second class consists of the still more numerous

* The fair traders in soap and candles received considerable assistance and advantages from the acts 24 Geo. III. ch. 11—36—48. And the Irish parliament have, during the present session, laid taxes on their makers of soap and candles.

† P. 77.

body whose capitals are employed in furnishing hardware, ironmongery, and cutlery. The first class are the suppliers of the raw material; the second are the consumers of it: the interest of the first consists in selling as dear as possible; and that of the second in buying as cheap. The advantages of the iron masters further depend upon the prevention of the import of any slit or bar iron. The interests of the cutlers, the ironmongers, and button-makers, consist in allowing the import of iron, whether bar, slit, or rolled, duty free, from every quarter of the world. But, the public interest having on most occasions happened to concur with the views of the iron masters, duties have been imposed from time to time on foreign iron imported, till it has risen to £.2 16s. 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. a ton. The whole of which, except a moiety of the old subsidy, is drawn back on the exportation; so that of the whole

—————	£.2 16 1 $\frac{1}{4}$
there remains only ————	£.0 3 6

and the drawback is ————	£.2 12 7 $\frac{1}{4}$
--------------------------	------------------------

In this operation of revenue and regulation it is apparent, that the interest of the second class was sacrificed to the first, because the raw material became thereby somewhat dearer in the home market, and somewhat cheaper in the foreign one.

Yet, under this management, the import of foreign iron has increased; the making of pig, bar, and slit iron, continues to augment year after year; and at no time was there more work done by the cutler, ironmonger, and hardwareman, than at present. The quantity of iron yearly imported, and the

the revenue thereon, were, according to a three years average, ending

			Tons.		Taxes.
with	1715	—	15,036	—	£.37,998
with	1782	—	42,638		£.131,006

It is generally supposed, though the fact cannot be known, because it is carefully concealed, that the quantity of iron made in Britain is nearly equal to the quantity imported. But much of the foreign iron is again exported, and one sixth of the whole to Ireland. And the home-made iron has consequently a great advantage in the home market.

British bar iron is generally sold at	£.20	per Ton
Swedish	—	17 0 0
Russia assorted	—	16 0 0
Ditto old sable	—	15 5 0
Ditto new sable	—	14 5 0

The great variety of iron, which, at these different prices, we actually find in the home market, evinces that each variety is applied to some different purpose: and we may presume too, that the British bar iron is applied to the most valuable purposes, otherwise it could not stand the competition of the foreign at so low a price. The manufacturers of Birmingham, Wolverhampton, and Sheffield, have their choice which kind of iron, whether bar, slit, or rolled, they will buy: and they can afford to give £.20 a Ton for British, otherwise they would buy Russia old sable at £.14 5 0. The truth seems to be, what indeed is acknowledged by all parties, that so little of the raw material goes into a button, or a knife, that its price is not of so much consideration; and that

it is by the division and subdivision of labour, and by a very peculiar skill, the English have excelled the world in cutlery, ironmongery, and in hardware.

If we may compare a trifling manufacture to a vast one, it may be observed, that Ireland has her iron masters and her iron manufacturers, though upon a much smaller scale, whose interests are equally distinct, and who, in the same manner, enter into competition with each other. Neither class seem to have prospered hitherto, though the Irish might always have sent their iron wares to any foreign market (the Colonies till lately excepted), and even to Britain, though in most instances subject to high duties here. The want of ore, fuel, and other requisites, near the scite of their furnaces, has allowed the iron masters very little profit on their capitals. The augmented quantity of foreign iron, which, year after year, has been imported into Ireland, at the low duty of ten shillings and six pence a ton, may have had its effect. There were imported, according to a three years average, ending

	with	1773	—	5951	Tons
	with	1783	—	8661	
of which from Britain in the first					
period	—		—	2218	Tons
Ditto from Ditto in the second				3736	
Ditto from the East Country in the					
first period	—		—	3736	
Ditto from Ditto in the second				4924	

We may easily infer, that the price of bar, slit, and rolled iron, must necessarily be higher in Ireland than in Britain. For, whether the importation be from the East Country or from Britain, every

every charge must be enhanced. If from the first, the voyage is longer far, and more dangerous, and the commodity is paid for in bills on London, which are never accepted without a commission:— If the importation is from Britain, there must be an additional profit to the merchant, and double freight and double charges of importation. Owing to these causes chiefly, the prices of bar iron, in Britain and in Ireland, are nearly as follows:

	Irish Prices.	British Prices.
Irish and British bar	£.20 per Ton	£.20 per Ton
Swedish	17 10 0	17 0 0
Russia	16 10 0	16 0 0
Nail Rods and Hoops	18 15 0	14 5 0

Notwithstanding the drawback in Britain, and the lower duty in Ireland, we see that, in fact, the prices are higher in Ireland than in Britain. It is apparent, that the Irish iron masters cannot increase much their inconsiderable quantity of bar and slit iron, without laying greater duties on the import of foreign iron. Their interests concurring thus with the interests of the public there, as it does here, it is at least possible that the Irish Parliament will imitate the British one in this respect.

It is a question, which requires a more serious answer, how far would the proposed arrangements affect the interest of Great Britain on the subject of Iron. From this country we have hitherto supplied Ireland with iron. We have sent to Ireland during the last five years, since the trade of Ireland was free, hard-ware and ironmongery, to a greater value than we ever did, in any former period. Ireland may hereafter send hers on the same duties, if the Resolutions should pass into a law. She insists,

insists, that the principle of an *equal* commerce requires, that she ought to have a fair chance in the British markets, by paying on the import the same duties as British iron-wares pay in Ireland, subject however to further duties on importation here, to countervail the difference of duty in the raw material in the two countries. Would this be injurious if the point should be granted? It would however be a waste of time to reason further on the impossibility of Ireland sending her iron manufactures into this country; because the manufacturers themselves, who have expressed most fears respecting the proposed Resolutions, have never suggested an idea of a rivalship in the home consumption; their apprehensions are confined to the competition in the American and other foreign markets, in which the intended arrangement makes no alteration whatsoever.

Our author was so employed in founding the alarm about the high duties in Britain, and the low ones on the import of iron into Ireland, that he forgot to tell us the actual price of the raw material in both. He forgot too to mention, that hardware, ironmongery, and cutlery, being now made in Britain, as good and as cheap as possible, the Irish cannot make them better, or cheaper; he has left us to conjecture, how it has happened, that the Russians and Swedes do not excell the world in cutlery. And we shall leave him with the iron masters of Ireland to contrive ways and means for procuring additional duties on foreign iron, who have alone an interest in this measure; and proceed with him to the last article

Of C O R N.

Our Author seems to have written this short article with design chiefly of suggesting to the Scots, that the Union is about to be violated, by the proposed arrangements. He knew, that the Scots populace are the most easily led to tumult on the subject of victual, from a scarcity of which they are most apprehensive. Yet, despairing of success from a measure, whose evident tendency is to keep the price of grain steady and uniform, he appeals to the landed interest, as being in "the most imminent danger." And in his zeal to inflame, he forgot to mention, that this steadiness and uniformity of price, in the corn-market, has been recommended by the most judicious writers, as the true interest of the land-owners and farmers themselves, were the interests of the poor out of the question.

But the 7th Resolution of the Irish parliament makes an express exception, "as to corn, meal, malt, flour, and biscuit:" So that the proposed arrangements do not, in fact, extend to the difficult subject of grain, which, as the supposed secretary has said, "must be arranged separately."

Our author did not choose to recollect that the Act of Union has been often explained, and sometimes amended: That, during the scarcity of the year 1783, large quantities of grain were imported from Ireland into Scotland, contrary to the express provisions of *The Union*: That it has happily become

become one of the standing laws of the land, to allow the importation of beef, bullocks, butter, pork, and other articles of "*victual*," duty free, from Ireland, though not from foreign countries. It would perhaps be wise to extend the principle of their regulation to the permitting of the sister kingdoms to supply each other with grain, when the price rises above a proper medium, to be agreed on and established. The home markets of both would thereby be supplied with corn at reasonable rates. If our Author thinks, that high and fluctuating prices are for the advantage of any class, he may be answered in his own language, "the whole body of manufacturers throughout Great Britain are of a very different opinion." Happy is it for our domestic quiet, that the country gentlemen and farmers are not actuated by a monopolizing spirit, otherwise no prudence or policy could prevent a civil war at the end of every harvest. So difficult is it to arrange the complicated interests of an empire of various competitors.

From minute discussions with regard to our navigation, our manufactures, and our agriculture, our author proceeds to more general declamations, as to

THE EQUIVALENT.

He naturally calls the attention of his readers to the terms of Union with Scotland. It was the policy of that epoch to *unite* the subjects of the same

same king. It was the "retrograde wisdom of late times," to *divide* the empire, by making their legislatures more distinct, and the trade of the sister kingdoms more free with foreign countries than frequent with each other. But it is the avowed principle of the proposed arrangements to *conjoin* the divided empire, by a stronger sense of mutual affection and interest, to knit them together by communications both of confidence and commerce. In stating how much Scotland was to give "towards payment of the debts of England, previous to the Union," our Author forgets *the equivalent*, which was conferred on her, of half a million: and in estimating the *equality of trade*, he as little recollects, that the annual sum of two thousand pounds was granted for ever towards promoting the woollen and other manufactures of Scotland. But, though not invidiously, it may be truly said, that the revenue paid by Scotland is not equal to the one-fifth part of that paid by Ireland; of which a surplus is hereafter to be given to this country towards the general expence of the empire, besides maintaining a part of our military abroad, and supporting her whole civil and military establishments at home. The revenue yielded by the one country or the other was not, perhaps, the chief object in desiring a closer union with either. It was a desire of that energy which arises from bringing the disjointed parts of the same country closer together; it was the dread of future separation; it was our inclination to preserve mutual good will, and to obtain future good offices; that established the union with Scotland, and produced the arrangements with Ireland.

In treating of equivalents we ought to consider the value of what we give, before we weigh in a scrupulous balance what we are about to receive. The trade of the sister kingdoms with foreign countries is to be adjusted in such a manner as that an effectual preference shall be given to the produce of each other. Such a preference was always given by the laws of both. And were this proposal to be carried into practice, it would rather be the continuance of the old than the introduction of any new regulation. England appears to have at all times engrossed the principal part of the trade of Ireland. And it is easy to foretell which of them will in future possess the greatest commercial advantages. That this country will enjoy a *monopoly of consumption*, our Author will not, however, believe, though the Irish Parliament have imposed, since the resolutions were passed, a duty of *10 per cent.* of the value on almost every article of merchandize imported, except from Great Britain.

But American produce is hereafter to be sent from the ports of Ireland to Britain. Such a proposal naturally leads us to consider that, as far as that has any effect, it must increase the quantity of shipping and freight. The island, which must in every age have the greatest number of ships, will derive the greatest benefit, whether we regard the public or the individual. Much was, doubtless, given when Ireland was allowed to traffic to Africa and America. But, it is not quite so clear what peculiar benefit is to result to Ireland, by allowing the surplus merchandize (if any), which may be collected from that intercourse, to be sent to Britain, in British ships, by British subjects. Were these surplusses to be sent to Hamburgh (as by law they may),

may), the profit of the sales would be lost to the British merchants. On the other hand, were these surplusses transmitted to Britain, the advantage of the sales and the remittance would be saved to British residents. Mutual dealings always create mutual benefits. And till it is clearly settled what peculiar gain would result to Ireland, wherein Britain does not participate, it cannot be determined what equivalent ought to be given by one country to the other. From this measure, our Author, however, insists, “* that Ireland is gradually to intercept all the great sources of revenue, which have flowed from the interchange of the various commodities of the various quarters of the world with our own native commodities.” By shutting the ports of Ireland, the interception, which he thus deplores, would partly ensue. By opening her ports, we should furnish a large proportion of her foreign cargoes, and receive in return the products of foreign countries. And the interchange being mutually advantageous, it is difficult to decide what equivalent ought to be asked, or given.

Where the manufactures of the sister kingdoms are already imported into each other duty-free, it is proposed that a regulation, which has proved so beneficial to both, shall always continue. In this case, according to our Author, there is nothing *new* given †: and consequently there is nothing for which a *return* ought to be asked.

But, where moderate duties are paid on one side, and prohibitory ones on the other, it is proposed to reduce the tax to the most moderate rate. On this head of the arrangements Ireland would apparently

* P. 89.

† P. 79.

have the advantage. But, in return, she allows to be sent, on easy duties, raw materials to the amount of half a million, without which this country must depend on other nations. On which side the advantage, in such an interchange of manufacture for raw material, would ultimately turn, requires not the spirit of prophecy to foretell.

Distracted as much by temper as by zeal of opposition, our Author views Ireland “* cloathing herself with the ready spoils of the British market.” Instead of acquiring any equivalent from Ireland, we are, according to him, about to impoverish the most productive of our own taxes by the emigration of consumers: The stockholders are thereby to lose their security †, and the landholders their rents. Yet he celebrates at the same time the wisdom of the reign of Queen Anne, which gave, by the act of Union, a perpetual annuity, for encouraging the manufactures of Scotland.

If I might use our Author's language, I should say, this was giving a bounty on the emigration of the English to Scotland. But, has this bounty produced such an emigration? Or has it been constantly said, by writers of no small account, that England had become depopulated during the course of the present century but from the vast influx of people from Scotland and Ireland. The tide is now to turn. And the emigration is at

* P. 89.

† Since these resolutions have been depending, indeed since the public has been persuaded of their being acceded to, the stocks have risen more than 4l. per cent. and that too at a time of the year when they are generally falling, previous to the budget.

length to flow from the rich country to the poor; from the country where the industrious classes live well to that where they would live worse; from the country where the labouring poor have a right to a comfortable provision, during sickness or age, to the kingdom "where there are no parish establishments, no sanctuary for the aged and infirm." All this is not only probable, but, according to our Author, is certain.

Mr. Peele is to retire to Ireland. He too had his concealments at the bar of the House of Commons, as our Author has before the public. He did not tell what he knew to be too true, that he has in Lancashire many competitors in every branch of his business, who would rejoice to see him depart; who are daily enticing his best workmen, and soliciting his most constant customers; who are pushing him off the stage, that they may fill his place. Such are the constant competitions of a manufacturing country. The old, or the opulent, no sooner retire, than their stations are instantly occupied by the young, or the adventurous. Mr. Peele may carry his cash to Ireland; but he cannot easily transport his warehouses, his workmen, his credit, or his customers. If that were possible, he would after all have the disadvantages to encounter which have been already stated. It is of no consequence to the state, whether the revenue is paid by the hand of Mr. Peele, or by that of his greatest rival.

Loud as our Author has sounded the alarm, the stock-holders and land-holders have therefore little to fear. They have both suffered too much from the American war, to hope for any good from the revival of civil disputes. And their true interest consists

consists too much in domestic quiet, and in the long absence of war, to aid our Author, or his party, in embroiling our affairs a-new.

But what plan of proportionate, or any supplies, asks our profound Commentator, may be expected from Ireland in the event of future wars? This question may be answered by another: When has Ireland ever shewn a backwardness to contribute on emergencies? did she not hold out her hand to assist in extricating this country in the last war, which was an unpopular one there? and what was at last closed by the sense of parliament here, after having long been against the sense of the country. While the residence of the mutual Sovereign of both kingdoms is confined to the greater by a thousand bonds, the British Ministers must be intrusted with the government of both for the happiness of each: and, being thus invested with a great trust, they must be answerable for the faithful discharge of it to a great tribunal. It is to this trust and to this responsibility to which we must refer our Author for answers to many questions, as to the future conduct* of Ireland, in foreign or domestic policy.

He is, however, too angry to be easily satisfied. He will not believe, that Ireland is in earnest, though her Parliament has actually imposed additional taxes, amounting to £150,000, in compliance with her virtual engagements. Nor will he credit the solemn assurances of the Irish Lords and Commons, that the proposed arrangements contain a *final establishment* of their *commercial interests*. And while he endeavours to instil distrust into

* P. 84.

others,

others, he will have no confidence in the declarations of the Irish Parliament made to the Crown, "that this system, being thus established on the firm basis of reciprocal advantages, will effectually strengthen and cement the common interest and mutual affection of both kingdoms, and will indissolubly unite the efforts of all his Majesty's subjects of Great Britain and Ireland, in maintaining the strength, increasing the resources, and extending the power of the British empire."

These representations, however weighty, force no conviction on our Author's mind. In vain does the Irish legislature reason, That the commercial interest of Ireland being finally settled, the advantage of the one kingdom ought to be deemed the profit of the other; that the benefits of each being thus mutual, the revenue, private and public, of both, ought to be calculated as the firmest foundation of the British empire; that, actuated by these considerations, the legislature had augmented its standing income, and provided an increasing fund for contingent purposes, in order to evince to the world, that the conjoined strength of both kingdoms will form in future the collected power of the whole.

Candour ought to admit, that were it true, as our Author asserts in the midst of his reverie, that the emigration of the British manufacturers, the transfer of British wealth, the defalcation of British revenue, and the general impoverishment of the British people, are to result from the proposed arrangements; no possible equivalent ought to be regarded as adequate. How far such assertions, however, are founded; how far they are not destroyed by their own wildness; must be left to the decision

decision of those who have had the patience to peruse the foregoing pages.

The length and the tediousness of these sheets will, it is hoped, be attributed, in some measure, to a desire of vindicating truth from the sophisms of design; of exposing the factious purposes of a party man; who, having formerly lost his popularity by defending the rights of Ireland, now contradicts himself by attempting to regain what he had lost in a just cause; and who, having acquired credit by avowing the most liberal sentiments on the subjects of commerce and government, chooses, from whatever motive, to relinquish his consequence, by propagating the interested jealousies of petty minds; and who, having, with his friends, lost his situation in attempting a measure, which would have established them in power to the destruction of the constitution, now attempts to make a stalking horse of the manufacturers of this country, in order to overthrow the present Administration, who cannot have any selfish view in carrying the present measure. Malignity has not indeed imputed an interested motive to them in any part of the business. The best Answer, however, which can be given to his objections, and to the clamours of his party, may be at last found in the Report of the Committee of Council: "The present question, say they, is
 " not, whether the proposed System of Commerce
 " is better or worse than that which existed be-
 " fore the change made in the Irish Constitu-
 " tion; but, whether it is better or worse than
 " that which, if some agreement is not made, is
 " likely now to take place."

T H E E N D.